

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL
MYSORE MINISTERS' SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967.

Motion to consider--(Debate continued.)

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I refer to rule 28, 'Allotment of time for private members' business'. This is an imperative rule given under Chapter VI. That rule says:

“ The Speaker, after considering the state of business of the Assembly, may allot so many days as may in his opinion be opinion be possible, compatibly with the public interest for Private Members business and may allot different days for the disposal of different classes of such business; and on days so allotted for any particular class of business, business of that class shall have precedence. On other days no business other than Government business shall be transacted except with the consent of the Leader of the House.”

Then there is a proviso to that rule. This rule and the proviso to it are very imperative. We have been sitting now for nearly 40 days and we are entitled as a matter of right to at least 5 days or an absolute minimum of 4 days for non-official business. Now even if we consider the Bill that was passed in the morning as non-official business because it refers to the salaries of Members, by no stretch of imagination can it be said that the Bill now given notice of by the Hon'ble Member, Sri Siddaiah Kashimath so far as Ministers's salaries is concerned, is a non-official business, because if it is non-official business then these Ministers must be treated as non-officials. If it is non-official business, these Ministers and their salaries will have to be governed not by a different Act but by the same Act which we just now passed this morning. Therefore my objection to this is this, that we are entitled as a matter of right to at least 4 days. You have got non-official business on hand. It is not as though there is no non-official business available for transaction. When such is the position, in the first place Sri Siddaiah Kashimath has no *locus standi* to bring this Bill. He is not a hireling of the Ministers.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do not use that word. I object to the word “hireling”.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I must use and I am prepared to take any punishment that comes for it because the Hon'ble Member has no business to sponsor this Bill on behalf of the Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order To call another Member a “hireling” is something highly objectionable.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What I said is that he is not the hireling of the Ministers. I did not say that he is the hireling of the Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hireling is not a word to be used by any Member. The word “hireling” used with reference to any Member is an insinuation against him.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will press it further. Now the point is, so far as the Hon'ble Member is concerned, he is not a Minister, he is not even a Member of the Treasury Benches. He has no right to sit here and if he were to move this Bill and say that this Bill is sponsored on behalf of the Opposition Party Members. That apart, I humbly submit that this Ministers, Salary Bill is not a non-official business and on a non-official day official business cannot be transacted. We are, as a matter of right, entitled to 4 days. We have now hardly 2½ hours more and so we request you to take up non-official business and not this business.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಅರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಉಚಿತ ನಿರೀನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈಗ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ವಾಟರ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ನವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ನಾಗರಿಕರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಠಿಣದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಉಚಿತ ನಿರೀನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯತಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದು ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ ? ಈ ದಿನ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದೇ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಆದ್ಯತೆಕೊಡುವುದೆಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ?

3-30 P.M.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Sir, if you permit I wish to say that the point of order raised by Sri H. Siddaveerappa is not supported either by rules or any provisions of the constitutional law. The position is we are working on days allotted for non-official work. The question is what is non-official work. The interpretation by Sri H. Siddaveerappa is that any matter involving finance is official. Every Hon'ble member of this House has a right to move a resolution or Bill regarding any subject, whether it has financial implications or not.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಇನ್‌ಫರ್ಮೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಜೆಟ್ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷ ಆಕಡೆಯ 20 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಕಠಿಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—The point is that every hon'ble member a right to bring a resolution or a Bill, regarding every subject which is included in the list of State subjects specified in the Constitution. That is the legal position. Now, a private business is work which a member of the House brings, whether he is a member belonging to the Congress or any other party on the other side. That is the meaning. Any Motion brought by a member who is not a member of the Government is private members business. Therefore any resolution brought by any member who is not a member of the Government, that is, cabinet can be brought under the rule.

(Interruptions)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri M. G. BANAKAR.—Clarification please.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I am not yielding. Therefore the Bill brought by Sri Siddiah Kashimath is a private members business, brought as a non-official business. Apart from this, the Business Advisory Committee has considered it and they have given priority to this Bill, and allotted sometime and that report has been approved by the House. Therefore, it is not open to any member to challenge it. Unless that is finished, no other business can be taken up.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಸಕರ ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವ ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆ ಇದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಿಜೆಸ್ ಎಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ ?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Yes, any Bill brought by a private member is a non-official work.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ದುಗ್ಗಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾದೇಶದ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರು ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? ಎಲ್ಲೆಯಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ? ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಫೈನಾನ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಬಿಜೆಸ್ ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I will give a ruling.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಜನರಲ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಹೆಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ? ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ? ಇದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

Council of Minister selected by the Chief Minister. He is the head of the Council of Ministers. So, this Council of Ministers can be changed according to the whims and fancies of the Leader of the House. It is not so in the case of members. A member is elected once in five years for a full term. So, this clear distinction is there. That is why in the Constitution salaries of the Minister and salaries of the members are brought under two headings.

I bring to your kind notice what is contained in Article 195. It reads as follows :

“Members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of a State shall be entitled to receive such salaries and allowances as may from time to time be determined by the Legislature of the State by law and, until provision in that respect is so made, salaries and allowances at such rates and upon such conditions as were immediately before the commencement of this Constitution applicable in the case of members of the Legislative Assembly of the corresponding Province.”

Then coming to the duties of Council of Ministers the Article 163 reads as follows :

“ There shall be a council of Ministers with the Chief Minister as the head to aid and advise the Governor in the exercise of his functions, except in so far as he is by or under this Constitution required to exercise his functions or any of them in his discretion.”

Their functions are described here. Then coming to the salaries and allowances of Ministers, they have to be fixed by the fixed by the Legislature of the State by law and until the legislature determines, they have to be paid the salaries as specified under the Second schedule.

ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆ ಪಡ್ಯೂಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಆಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್ಸ್ ಸಂಬಳ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಸಕರ ಸಂಬಳ ಇವನ್ನು ಬಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಡ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಜನರರ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಗವರ್ನರ್, ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್ಸ್, ಇವರದ್ದೆಲ್ಲ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಭಾಸಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಒಂದು ಬಿರ್ ತಂದು ರಾಜ ಧನವನ್ನಾಗಲೀ, ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನಾಗಲೀ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರಿಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಬೇಕು, ಅದರ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇವತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರು ಬಜೆಟ್ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಥವಾ ಆರೋಯಿನ್ಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. It is clearly against the principles of budgetting itself. It is purely a Government business. ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯಾಡಳಿತ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಯಿನ್ಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಭಾಸಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಪಾಯಕಾರಿ ತತ್ವವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಎರಿಕೆ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಭಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಗಣನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಕಾನೂನು ಬಾಹಿರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳದ ಎರಿಕೆ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಭಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದು ಕಾನೂನು ಬಾಹಿರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of order is raised by invoking Rule 28. He said that the business is not the Government business and therefore the Bill could not have been brought by a member as Mr. Shivappa contended. It was also mentioned that this being the non-official day this business cannot therefore be taken. Another member contributed another idea that some other work is more important and therefore that should have been given priority and this could be taken later. The members must understand that one reason must be put forth and all members cannot bring all the ideas at a time.

(Some members stood up to speak)

To-day is the last day and if it is necessary I will undoubtedly enforce the rules. If a point of order is raised that member alone is entitled to raise and others should not disturb and should not raise their points of orders in the middle.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಬಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ದಾಪ್ಪನವರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾರೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದಾಗ....

Mr. SPEAKER.—This member is going on imagining things. I have not mentioned his name.

The whole point is whether the business before the House is official or non-official. It might be remembered at what stage this point is raised. It was never said it is official business though vaguely hinted with regard to the contents of the Bill, because the procedure and function followed is one relating to non-official business. If matters contained in the Bill relate to one or two officers or council of Ministers it becomes official is highly fallacious.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, that Bill is not introduced. When did he introduce? If it was introduced it must have been stealthily introduced. We were here. For about 2 minutes we were out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The members read the proceedings.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Even if it is introduced...

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member is again wrong. To-day it was taken up after it was introduced. I will appeal to every member that nobody should disturb.

Mr. AZEEZ SAIT.—What happened was that Sri Siddiah Kasimath has introduced two Bills together. It was wrong. One Bill at a time has to be introduced. The second Bill was not moved. That is what had happened.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am reading the proceedings.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—My we know at what date it was introduced. He wanted to introduce both the Bill. I raised a point of order. I do not know if the bill was introduced to day. Please look into the proceedings. Please refer to the proceedings, You will find what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This kind of thing is highly improper to say the least. Members will find from today's agenda that it will be taken into consideration.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—This is just the time when we can say, that it should not be taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Member's thinking is very wrong.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I may be a stupid man. But still I have a right to say that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whatever is said it must be said correctly.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—According to my conscience, it is correct. If it is wrong, it may be corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is exactly what I want to read. "Laying of Papers; Legislative work—Introduction of Bill—Mysore Legislature Salaries Amendment Bill; Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances Amendment Bill, 1967; consideration of Bills."

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What about the point of order that was raised? You please refer to that. I perfectly remember that a point of order was raised by me. You were pleased to give a ruling that both cannot be introduced together.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whoever said that they have been introduced together? They were introduced one after another.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—My contention is that it was not introduced. Mr. Siddiah Kashimath wanted to introduce both the Bills in one sentence. I raised a point of order that both cannot be introduced together. You also said that they cannot be introduced together. If it is not introduced today, it was not also introduced on the previous day. You may find it out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am surprised at the assertions that are made. True it is that when Mr. Siddiah Kashimath wanted two Bills to be introduced together, point of order was raised and I upheld that point of order and thereafter the two Bills were introduced one after another.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—No.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What do you mean by saying 'No'? I allowed to say. It is your opinion. If anybody thinks that his opinion supersedes the recorded proceedings, I do not know how to mention it.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I have a right to correct the Speaker if he goes out of the way.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member must say on a Point of order.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—We are not here only to raise points of order. We are here to correct everybody. As I have got a right to correct myself and submit to your decision, I have also a right to correct you if there is anything wrong. Whenever you give a ruling, if we find anything wrong, not on account of any bad intention towards us, but out of heavy work if you say anything out of the way, we have every right to correct you and bring facts to your notice and to remind you about the previous proceedings and then get a better judgment in our own interest. You were kind enough to us and we are very much thankful to you. But at the same time it is our bounden duty whenever you give a ruling or whenever a point of order is ruled out, not on y I but every member sitting here has a right to say either for or against it. Even at the time of pronouncing your rulings, we have a right to tell you that you are wrong.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Please bear with us. Why should you get restless with us today?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not restless. I read over the proceedings.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Secretary says that it was introduced on 31st and I have nothing to disbelieve him. Even if it is introduced and even if it is taken into consideration, my objection stands good under rule 28. Please consider it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore Members must realise when I read out the proceedings.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I was under honest impression that it was not introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Member is not bona fide of that opinion, he would not have taken so much of time. The fact is that I have no option but to apply guillotine. Let it not afterwards be said that debate was not allowed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋವಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ನಮ್ಮನ್ನೇ ಗಲ್ಲಗೇ ಹಾಕಿ ಬಿಡಿ !

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even if the Members ask me to put them to 'galli' I am not the man. I will try to avoid it. Now it is conceded, at any rate, it has been taken that the Bill has been introduced. I was mentioning if the Bill is not one that has to be introduced as a non-official Bill, objection should have been taken at the very inception. Matters did not remain there. After the Bill was introduced, it was referred to a Committee on Non-official Bills for a Report on allocation of time. The Committee dealt with it and allotted 3½ hours time for the two Bills together. All this was again discussed in the morning. Without introduction how it could have happened, I do not know. If it is an official Bill, how it could go to that Committee, I am unable to understand. The error appears to be that because it relates to Minister's salary, which might or might not be passed, and the Ministers in the Treasury Bench form part of the Government, it is official Bill and so it is official work. That is not correct. Whatever might be the distinction between private and public Bill in England, in India there is hardly any distinction between public Bill and private Bill as such. It depends upon the person who brings it. If it is sponsored or introduced by a member who is not a member of the Council of Ministers, then it become non-official. That is why it goes before that Committee. It went there and got the time allotted. Whatever might be the contents of the Bill, if it is sponsored by the Government, then it becomes a Government business. That is how allocation is made between official and non official. A layman might think that it is official but that view is not correct.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Hon'ble Minister Sri Kanthi has crossed the floor. I do not know whether he has changed party.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Hon'ble Minister is canvassing. This kind of business should not be allowed to go on under your very nose.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not completed my ruling.

I pointed out the other day that a point of order cannot be raised when I am giving a ruling. I will continue the ruling.

4-00 P.M.

It was also said that Members are entitled for two days for every fourteen days of official business. That Member forgot perhaps that

official days and non-official are decided well in advance. It is admitted that it is non-official day today. Non-official business is in its proper place. Even with regard to non-official business, the Members have overlooked the circumstances that as between the Bills and resolutions, Bills take precedence. Further, in the agenda which has been settled, this is placed higher and we have discussed in part. To say that that must be adjourned, must be by a motion accepted by the House. Members are needlessly mixing up ideas and trying to think that this can be pushed back and another thing can be taken.

Mr. Siddiah Kasimath may now move his motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ 28 ರ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಅಂತ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಮೊದಲೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್‌ಡೇ ಮತ್ತು ನಾನ್‌ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್‌ಡೇ ಅನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಎರಡು ಮನೂವೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೂರೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆ ಸಮಯ ಒಂದೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ತಿಳಿಸಿದಿರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೂರೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮೂರೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆ ಸೇರಿ 7 ಗಂಟೆ ಬರೀ ಒಂದು ಮನೂವೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಳೆದು ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್‌ಡೇ ಎಂದು ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಸಾಲದು, ನಾನ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್‌ಡೇ ದಿವಸ ಏನಾದರೂ ಬೇರೆ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ-ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸರ್‌ಪಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅಂತ ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಅದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು ಅಂತ ಇದೆ. ನಾನ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್‌ಡೇ ಅಂತ ಇದತ್ತು ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದವೇ ? ತಾವು ಸ್ಪಲ್ಡ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಪೀಟನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಒಂದು ವಾರದಲ್ಲ ಏನೇನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಅದರಲ್ಲ ಇದೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I think the point was dealt with in the morning.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಈ ಒಂದು ಮನೂವೆಗೆ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಟೈಂ ಆರಾಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡುವಂತಹದು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಮೂರೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಂಡೆವು. ಈಗ ಕಾರಾತಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಾನ್‌ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಥವಾ ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಂತ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಬೇಕು, ತಾವು ನಾನ್‌ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಂಟಿಂಟ್ಸ್ ಏನಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಟಡ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯರ್ ಅದರ ಕೆಲವು ನಿಯಮಗಳು ಕ್ರಮಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್‌ನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿ ನುಪುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಜನರರ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಖರ್ಚು ವೆಚ್ಚವನ್ನು.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಈ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಮತ್ತು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ಕಾರಣಗಳೇನು ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ತಾವು ಸ್ಪಲ್ಡ್ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Gopala Gowda raised a point of order and said some thing. I find there is no point of order arising out of it.

SRI L. SRIKANTIAH.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Article 163 of the Constitution may kindly be referred to. According to me, the Deputy Minister is no minister at all and he has no status in law inasmuch as Sri Kasimath Siddiah is trying to confer benefits from this amended Bill. I think it is a void piece of legislation. I substantiate the point as follows.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The professor is saying that it contravenes article 163; definition of Council of Ministers?

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—In the Council of Ministers, the Deputy Ministers do not come into the picture. In the article 163 of the Constitution, the Deputy Minister has no status in law. If an Hon'ble Member is a member of the Council of Ministers, only that person could be regarded as a Minister who has admission to the Cabinet. Now the Council of Ministers is equivalent to the Cabinet of ministers. The Deputy Minister does not sit in the Cabinet. It may be argued that the Deputy Minister deputises on behalf of the Minister in charge.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Minister's salary Bill is already on the Statute book.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—It is a void piece of legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to decide.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—This House is not going to decide and sit in judgement over it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If this House is not going to decide the *ultra vires* or the *intra vires*, I am not going to decide either.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—I am not asking you to consider and decide unless certain benefits are going to be conferred on Deputy Ministers who have no status in Law, this House cannot be expected to take notice of it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised by Sri Srikantiah that Deputy Minister is not mentioned in article 163 and this Bill is invalid. I told him that the statute that is already in existence refers to deputy Ministers. Even if it did not refer, his contention is that this is *ultra vires* and he agrees that this House is no final authority. If that is so, I am not going to decide whether it is *ultra vires* or *intra vires*. There is no point of order to be decided by the House, much less by me.

Sri DIGAMBAR RAO BALVANT RAO (Aland).—On a point of order, Sir. There is a resolution tabled by Sri M. S. Krishnan for constituting an expert committee for revising water rates. That resolution is there. There are also other resolutions which are also coming up for consideration. My submission is that in view of rule 27, the Bill that is now put up before this House for consideration is not so important as other resolutions that are to be taken up today. So, my submission is that under rule 27:

“...Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri Digambar Rao raises a point of order to ignore the agenda and the order in the agenda and to enter

into the demand of relative importance. It is surprising that such a thing should be stated in a point of order. There is absolutely no merit in the point of order raised.

† SRI K. H. PATIL.—I am quoting Rule 29 which is as follows :

“Private Members’ business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day :

“Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 28 and 2, any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day.”

I am substantiating my point. Now, it has been mentioned here in the Agenda as “Private Member’s Business.” Even though the Bill was taken notice of it was not put for discussion till yesterday. I have got here a book in support of my point; I will pass it on to you. What I am making out is that today we have Private Members’ business and the Speaker has to safeguard the interests of the Private Member. The Treasury Benches have got several opportunities to express their ideas in one form or another. But the Opposition lacks such enormous opportunities. The Opposition has no time to suggest constructive remedies. The Treasury Benches move several Bills and they have lot of scope for expressing their opinions. Although this motion is moved by my friend and put in his name, there are more important matters like naming this State as Karnataka, review of water rates, etc. The Opposition should not be deprived of their right to participate in these momentous issues which have been pressed through non-official resolutions.

SRI B. P. GANGADHAR.—I beg to differ from my hon’ble friend who said that we have no chance to make constructive suggestions. All that we have been making is constructive criticism. I presume my friend did not put in the proper form.

MR. SPEAKER.—My difficulty is that I have so many friends who do not put their ideas in the proper form at all.

SRI K. H. PATIL raises a point of order and refers to rules and gives me a book. The book he gives is May’s Parliamentary Practice. The points raised are nothing new. I have dealt with all these points. I have pointed out that a Bill has precedence over resolution. So far as the procedure is concerned, I have a feeling that these points are being raised with a view to see whether there is no rule which has been observed or not. I am glad that constructive suggestions are going to be given. I will rather wait for the debate to see what the constructive criticisms are. And if time is consumed on account of points of order and is not made available for debate, it is the persons who lose the time

(MR. SPEAKER)

that will have to analyse and find whether it was lost for reasons beyond their control or on account of any reasons specially followed in the course of the debate.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I am a successful mover of point of order and my points of order have been withheld in both the cases of privilege motion. My point of order is interesting.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಗ ನಾನು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪೇರಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ?

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ತಾವು, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಬೆಂಬಲವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತಿಷ್ಟು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಂತೆ ಸವಾಲನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾ ಕೋರಿದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಮಜಾರಿಬಿ ಇಲ್ಲದ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕವರು ಯಾರು, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We respect the Chair. We have got the highest respect to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to ask one thing. How many points of order have been raised ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As many as the occasion needs. An occasion like this has not arisen anywhere in any part of the world, in any Parliament or Legislature ; namely, the Ministers' Salaries and Allowances enhancement Bill being moved by a Private Member. There is no parallel anywhere in the history of India or in any democracy.

†Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I raise to a point of order. I will draw your kind attention to Rules 12, 13, 14 and 16. Now we have gone as far as Rules 12, 13 and 14 are concerned. Rule 14 says that "The Assembly shall commence and conclude at such time as the Speaker may from time to time direct." Now we have proceeded very nicely and earnestly up to rule 15. What has happened after Rule 15? The Assembly should conclude at 12-30 today. Please do not misunderstand that I am making any insinuation against the Chair.

Exactly at 12-30 P.M. the Assembly ought to have concluded ; at about 12-26 P.M. the Opposition staged a walk-out. By the time they returned to the Chamber, it was 12-30 P.M. After that the Speaker simply adjourned the House. Actually the members and the Speaker went on arguing and at about 12-35 P.M. or so, the Speaker was pleased to say : 'Now the House stands adjourned and shall meet at 3 P.M.'. It was very improper and illegal according to the rules. However, having directed us to come here, we have come at 3 O'clock. In the name of justice and fairplay and democracy, I only feel sorry that rule 15 was not adhered to. The Speaker had taken a little more power in this behalf. I have already said that I am not insinuating against the Speaker. We are here however well directed or ill-directed

Whatever insinuations and whatever charges that were made from the Treasury Benches, we have tolerated. Though you did not become angry then, whenever a straightforward thing or a honest thing is said from this side, you become angry and raise your voice and say 'order, order'. 'I call the member to order'; 'I will ask the member to retire'. I know you have no grudge against any member. Somehow you will have to control.

According to rule 15, exactly at 12-30 P. M. the House should have been adjourned and not even 12-31 P. M. If a man is to be hanged at a particular hour, he should be hanged exactly at that minute and not even one second late. But, here, the Speaker allowed discussion to continue till 12-35 P. M. and after that he adjourned. Therefore, the proceedings transacted thereafter are illegal and all that has gone into the record has no value and so everything will have to be expunged. You, as an able lawyer, may understand the basic argument of mine.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have reserved my ruling.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. Can a private member be allowed to take up the floor and transact Government business?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose this is dealt with by the rulings already given.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—That is our difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Those difficulties do not overlook the rules. These points are covered by the rulings. If the hon. member has any new point, he may raise. He cannot raise a point of order on my ruling already given.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Further the root cause for all this is this. What is happening here since 12-30 everybody knows and your goodself also knows. But, our difficulty is, we cannot express here. The Minister in charge of Parliamentary Affairs should have brought this Bill before the House. We did not know that the Bill is before the House. Now, it is made clear that it was introduced. In a hurry-burry it was introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not accept any point of order when I call upon Sri Siddaiah Kasimath.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—In that case, the hon. member will not be allowed to transact business.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order?

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is over-ruled. Sri Siddaiah Kashimath will speak.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—On a point of order under rule 311 Sir, because under rule 311 it will not amount to a questioning of your ruling; I want to draw a distinction. Under rule 311:

“(1) A point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such articles of the Constitution as regulate the business of the Assembly and shall raise a question which is within the cognizance of the Speaker.

“(2) A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the Assembly at the movement:

“Provided that the Speaker may permit a member to raise a point of order during the interval between the termination of one item of business and the commencement of another if it relates to maintenance of order in, or arrangement of business before, the Assembly.

“(3) Subject to conditions referred to in sub-rules (1) and (2) a member may formulate a point of order and the Speaker shall decide whether the point raised is a point of order and if so gives his decision thereon, which shall be final.”

Here, it can be seen there is no provision in the rule for postponing your decision. Whatever ruling you give, it shall be given here and now because there is no provision in the rule where your ruling can be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a mandatory point raised by saying that under rule 311, there is no provision for postponing of giving a ruling. With the wealth of his parliamentary experience, if he thinks for the first time that such a situation arises, I can very well understand. Rulings have been postponed. On the other hand, his reading is to impart into it that the ruling shall be given then and there, that day only—that word is not there.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That it should be postponed is not there. In view of the extraordinary situation, we would request you to give your ruling then and there. I know you are capable of giving it, Sir.

4-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am reserving my ruling because I find that there is absolutely nothing which compels the Speaker to give a ruling then and there on the subject. It will be dictating the Speaker to say that the ruling must be given then and there. Rules, if necessary, will have to be modified. If postponement is not there, it does not mean that the ruling should be given then and there. It is well within the experience of the members here that I have reserved my rulings.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ತಾವು ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅಗಿರುವವರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನ್ನು

ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಿಜರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ಕೂಡಲೇ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ರಿಜರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ರೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವ ನಡವಳಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾಳೆಯವರೆಗೂ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋಲಿಕ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಾಗ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನಮಗೆ ವೇದ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಉಂಟು. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನೂ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ತಾವೇ ಪ್ರೀಸಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜುಡೀಷಿಯರ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಸಹ ಪ್ರೀಸಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದಂಥ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮೂಲದ ವಿವಿಧ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ರೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ನಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಅದರ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri K. H. Patil suggests that there is much less power for the Speaker to postpone giving a ruling and he suggests that if a ruling is to be postponed it must be for a particular time. It is well known principle that hypothetically Speaker never gives any ruling. When a point arises that point has to be decided and if that point is put I feel it is to be decided then and there and I decide. I am unable to agree with any hypothetical point being put as point of order. One of the essential things that is stated relating to the point of order is those points that arise at the moment and it is also stated that a member shall not rise a point of order to ask for information, to explain his position. So to say 'when a question of motion being put', is hypothetical.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir, what about my point ? It is a strong point of order. Rules 14 and 15 are violated. The Speaker ought to have adjourned the House at 12-30 P.M. that point of order is not decided.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member has stated all that he had to say.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I may not be an LL.B., or B.L. As a member of the Assembly.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know whether this is the kind of respect for democracy the member wants to exhibit.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I have respect to the Chair. But what I wish to say is at 12-30 P.M. you should have adjourned the House. As it is not done rules 15 and 16 have been violated. That is the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised and I have stated that I am reserving my ruling. The point of order is that the whole meeting is illegal.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Otherwise it is a serious matter.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.....Sri Siddiah Kashimath.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—1956ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ತರಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಏರಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ತಾವು ಆಗಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ತೆಗೆದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ There is a point of procedure. What was the procedure that was adopted on that day? I request you to adopt the same procedure. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಏರಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಆಗ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಹೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನರಲ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಆದಳೆಂದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡ ಬಾರದು. ಅದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆಗಲೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಟ್ರೇಡ್ ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಜನರಲ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇ ಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತ ರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಇದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎತ್ತಿದಾಗ ಆ ಒಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅವರೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಅದವರಾದರೂ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Are you following the same convention? ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಇಂತಹ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಇಂತಹ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವತ್ತು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವೇತನವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ? 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೇ ಸಾಕು ಅಥವಾ 900 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೇ ಸಾಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವವರು ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a Point of Order?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಚೈರಮನ್ ಬೆಂಚಿನವರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸ ಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನುಮಾನಗಳನ್ನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವವನ್ನಾಗಲಿ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ನಾವು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನೇ ಕೇಳಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಮಾಜ ಯಿಷಿ ಫಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆದರೆ, ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕೇ? ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವ ಎದೆಗಾರಿಕೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನವೀಯತೆಯ ಮರುಕವಿಲ್ಲದ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿ ಮಂಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತರಬೇಡಿ. ಚೈರಮನ್ ಬೆಂಚಿನವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಥೈರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ,

ಬೇರೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಪೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಗೆ ಅನ್ನವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಹಗಲುದರೋಡೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am surprised that this member goes on talking like this.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Somebody from the Congress Benches has said that the Opposition has no commonsense. Is it parliamentary?

(Many members were simultaneously shouting)

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ತುಂಬಾ ವಿಧವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ಈಗ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿವಸ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ಪೋಸ್ಟ್‌ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಗೌರವ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ನಾನು ಏನಯದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Some little expression of opinion to indicate discontent is all right. I feel it is wrong to allow any latitude or violation of the rules. I will strictly enforce the rules.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೋ ವ್ಯಾಕುಲತೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಚೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ತಮಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸಚೇತಕರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡಿ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಶಾಂತಿ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಬಂದಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಿರಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರೂ ಇದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It cannot be adjourned at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the House wants, I have to sit, but to carry to extreme lengths and say, "We are dissatisfied; we are not contented; we are not happy and therefore the House should be adjourned." will be not at all respecting the decision of the House.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—We are happy and we are very much contented.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As far as I can remember, right from the beginning we have been imploring them and telling them 'Please move this measure yourself and don't try to introduce some element which is not healthy'. We have been telling them that this is not correct; still they persist. Therefore, there is no other alternative. Please do not mistake us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not the judge; the public is the judge.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Our patience is getting exasperated; it is coming to breaking point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, what should I do?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We will see what the consequences will be; that is different.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I call upon Sri Siddaiah Kasimath to speak.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಜನ್ಯಯ್ಯ.—6 ಗಂಟೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ತಯಾರಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಚೈದ್ವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಆದ್‌ಜರ್ನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Sir, I rise on a point of order. It is under Rule 29. Rule 29 says :

“Private Members’ business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day”

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no ballot because there are no other Bills.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Then, Sir, I wish to invite the attention of the House to sub-clause (2) I of rule 28 which refers to Bills to be introduced, Bills returned by the Governor under Article 200 or 201 of the Constitution and so on and so forth. In fact, he is now trying to move the motion for the consideration of this Bill. He has not yet been allowed to move it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has already moved the consideration motion.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Even then rule 28 (2) (a) says :

“On the days allotted for Private Members’ business in any session, unless any days have been allotted under sub-rule (1) for any particular class of business when business of that class shall have precedence, the business shall be taken up in the following order :...”

I may kindly be permitted to bring to your notice that this does not specify any Bill which is to be moved for the consideration of this House. Secondly, under rule 29 this was not the Bill that was taken up yesterday and continued for today and rule 29 does not say that because there was only one Bill, it is not necessary to hold any ballot.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What should have been done then ?

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—It should not have been taken up today and only the resolution that is standing in the name of Sri T. R. Shamanna should have been taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon’ble Sri Ranganath raised a point of order that this Bill should not have been taken up today. These points, if any, should have been taken up much earlier. It is too late in the day to raise them now. Apart from that, I do not want any member to have a feeling that the point raised by him has not been properly dealt with. Non-official business can be of two kinds primarily, namely, Bills and resolutions. Between these Bills and resolutions, Bills have precedence over the resolutions. I have already said that. Then it will be seen that inasmuch as resolutions are always more in number, ballot has been held and so this debate does not arise now. As regards, Bills, this is the only

Bill that is now outstanding and that Bill has priority over the resolutions and it has been so done in the agenda and the agenda has been sent to members and we have been doing business according to that agenda. If at this stage the point is raised that this should not have been done, I should feel that there is no merit in that. Sub-rule (4) says:

“Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2) Bills which have been introduced shall be so arranged as to give priority to Bills which are most advanced.”

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Sub-rule (2) (a) (i) deals with only “Bills to be introduced”. This is a Bill for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please see sub-rule (4) (i) “Bills which have been introduced”.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Sub-rule (3) says: “The Speaker may, by special order to be announced in the Assembly, make such variations in the relative precedence...”

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means, if it is included in the agenda, that has been invoked.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—This is not a Bill to be introduced, but this is a Bill to be moved for consideration of the House. Sub-rule (3) says: “The Speaker may, by special order to be announced in the Assembly...” My submission to you is that this was not announced yesterday in the Assembly. In fact, it was just included in the agenda. My submission is that it was not announced that this Bill would be taken up today. It is true that you have the power to vary the relative precedence by a special order, but that order should have been announced in the Assembly as per this sub-rule. That is my submission because the sub-rule says “The Speaker may, by special order to be announced in the Assembly...”. That should have been done yesterday itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sub-rule (4) which says:

“Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2), Bills which have been introduced shall be so arranged as to give priority to Bills which are most advanced.”

These two Bills have already been introduced. The rule further says:

“The relative precedence of Bills which are at the same stage shall be determined by ballot held on such day and in accordance with such procedure as the Speaker may prescribe.”

I can understand the objection by the member if there were at least two or three other Bills which are at the same stage. But there is only one Bill now and so this question does not arise.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—You were pleased to say that because we had only one Bill it was not taken up by ballot. If rule 28 is read with rule 29 you will see that ballot should have been held.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Ballot arises if there is more than one Bill and not otherwise.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Under rule 226 the Business Advisory Committee allots time for each business to be conducted in the House. The Business Advisory Committee allotted 3 hours for the two Bills, namely the Members Salaries Bill and the Ministers Salaries Bill. The time of 3 hours allotted has been exceeded and so *ipso facto* this particular business has to stop at that stage and the next business on the agenda has to be taken up. I request you, therefore, to see that no more discussion takes place on this. The water problem is a burning problem in Bangalore City. Instead of giving precedence to that, where is the urgency for passing the Ministers Salaries Bill? It can wait. So I submit let this water problem be settled first and in the next session or the adjourned meeting the Ministers Salaries Bill can be considered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with the matter of convenience. I have to decide the point of order.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—My submission is that if the time allotted by the Business Advisory Committee for these Bills is over, then they have again to go before the Business Advisory Committee and that committee has to allot further time and then it has to be taken up here and not otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of order of Sri Shamanna is that some other work is more important and that the time which was intended for this business has been spent and so that other business should be taken up being relatively more important. I do not think there is any point of order in it.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I request your permission to move a motion of very great importance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give Sri Sivappa permission until I have finished this work. The prescribed procedure must be followed. Simply because he wants to move something, I cannot allow it.

†**Sri S. BANGARAPPA.**—The point of order I have raised is under rule 311 (2) read with rule 28 (vi) and rule 29. First of all, I may kindly be allowed to deal with rule 311 (2). Sir, clause (2) of Rule 311 reads as follows:—

“A point of Order may be raised in relation to the business before the Assembly at the moment :”

So, clause (2) of Rule 311 deals with the actual business set down for the day.

5-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the settlement of the business which has been done prior!

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—I wish to draw your kind attention to Rule 28 clause (6), which says :

“Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rules (1) to (4) of this rule or in rule 133 the Speaker may, on any day allotted for Private Member business, give priority to any item of such business at the request of the member in charge.”

Rule 29 says :

“Private Members’ business set down for the day allotted for that class business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day :

Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in Rules 28 and 29 any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day.”

In this connection.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was the Member attentive when some other Member argued the same point ?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, it is a new point, which has got some other nature. Under sub-rule (6) of Rule 28, you will be pleased to see that the Private Members’ business will have to have its own priority. Further, it may please be considered that in the business of the day, there have been Resolutions set down for the consideration of this House, and the Ministers’ Salaries Bill, which has already been introduced on the Floor of this House by Sri Siddai.h Kashimath has already consumed most of the time allotted for Private Members’ business. In view of this, if that Bill is to be considered by this august House, then the Resolutions which have been set down for consideration will be lapsed, because under Rule 29 if this Bill is allowed to be considered or a discussion is allowed on this Bill, the entire time set down will be consumed by the discussion of that Bill. Therefore, the Resolutions which have been on the Agenda will not be considered at all on the Floor of this House. Also, please consider this aspect of the matter that there are a number of Resolutions and amongst them the most important is that which pertains to the abolition of Land Revenue. Therefore, I submit for your kind perusal and also consideration that the Resolution which deals with abolition of Land Revenue in our State will have the utmost importance when compared to the importance of the Bill for raising the salaries of Ministers. If the Resolutions set down for consideration of this House are allowed to lapse, the very purpose or importance will be taken away, because the people of our State are looking forward that this Resolution is important, and if it is allowed to lapse, the people of our State will be much harassed and they will ask us what

(SRI S. BANGARAPPA)

we are doing, what is this democracy and all that. This Bill is moved by an Opposition Member, because he has been almost purchased by the Treasury Benches.

SRI SIDDIAIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I cannot tolerate this. Nobody has purchased me so far as I am concerned.

MR. SPEAKER.—Who said like that?

SRI SIDDIAIAH KASHIMATH.—Nobody has purchased me so far. But, the Hon'ble Member, Sri Bangarappa mentioned that I have been purchased by the Treasury Benches.

MR. SPEAKER.—Did Sri Bangarappa say that Sri Siddaiah Kashimath has been purchased?

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, I may be permitted

MR. SPEAKER.—Did he say it or not? Kindly tell me 'Yes' or 'No'.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, that purchasing is according to me is that he has been influenced...

SRI SIDDIAIAH KASHIMATH.—Nobody has influenced me in this regard, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, Order. It is unbecoming for any Member, whosoever he might be, to say that he has been purchased.

SRI L. SRIKANTIAIAH.—Even if he has said, what harm is there, Sir? After all, Sri Bangarappa has spoken the truth; the truth is there.

MR. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Member Sri L. Srikantiah is always generous, moderate and restraint. He thinks that he can speak when I am on my legs. He should not do that. When I say that I object to the word, what does it mean? I do not think indecency could go further to say that one Member has been purchased by another Member. If he has said that, he will kindly withdraw.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA. He may be permitted to explain.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, Order! Members go on using expressions and say that he will explain, he did not mean like that, etc. Will the House go on spending time like this?

SRI V. N. PATIL.—Sir, I may be permitted to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, Order, I am not allowing.

SRI V. N. PATIL.—Are we not entitled even to make a request to you, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER.—What is that request?

SRI V. N. PATIL.—Before penalising somebody, the Chair has full powers to consider whether he is justified in saying like that. He may

be given a chance to explain, and if you feel satisfied with the explanation, the question of withdrawing does not arise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A request has been made and in so making the request, Sri Patil seems to be sitting in judgement. He thinks that an opportunity might be extended to Sri Bangarappa to explain his position. Sri Siddaveerappa made the same point. I said that Sri Bangarappa may withdraw the word if he has said. *Prima facie*, it is absolutely incorrect to use such words by any Member to any other Member.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, no doubt, I have used that word. But, it was not my intention to harm personally Sri Siddaiah Kashimath in this context. What I meant was that he has been influenced or induced or persuaded by the Treasury benches. Therefore, I submit that if my words have really hurt the feelings of Sri Siddaiah Kashimath

Mr. SPEAKER.—Don't put it in a qualified manner. Is he expressing regret or apologizing or not?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, if

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want 'if'.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—If Sri Siddaiah Kashimath feels that he is hurt, I am prepared

Mr. SPEAKER.—I call upon Sri Bangarappa to unconditionally withdraw the words. Will he or not?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, I respect the Chair, I withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Siddaiah Kashimath may kindly overlook it.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, I was dealing with the importance of Rule 29 and also Rule 28 which refer to Private Members business. The Bill of Sri Siddaiah Kashimath was set down for this day and it has already consumed the time allotted to it. It cannot be given any further time. Therefore, I want a ruling on this point and also I want to remind you that you have got discretionary powers. Therefore, I appeal to you to use your discretionary powers and extend time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Point of order was ultimately reduced to an appeal to me to use of my discretion. I have made abundantly clear that I have no discretion in this matter. Same points were raised by others and the ruling has been given. Repeated point of orders are coming forward. I do not know whether it is the right use of the privilege given to the Members to raise points of orders. Raising the same point does not come with great efficacy. Mr. Siddaiah Kashimath

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ.—ನಾನು ಅಗರೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I raise a point of order, Sir. My point of order is that the Business Advisory Committee allotted 3½ hours for two Bills viz. Member's Salary and Allowances Bill and the Ministers Salary and Allowances Bill. Now instead of 3½ hours more than 8 hours were

(SRI AZEEZ SAIT)

consumed for discussion on Members Salary Bill. This morning you were kind enough to say that 1½ hours more will be given for this and later on you suggested that even 1½ hours may not be sufficient and it may require a little more.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My time to shut out this time has not yet come.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Instead of 1½ hours, a little more time may be granted to us. If two hours are granted, it would be 7-15 P. M. But the time allotted to this business is lapsed. Therefore the other business is lapsed. Therefore the other business on the Agenda must be taken up.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Under Rule 322, I request you to suspend the Rule 153 (a) and (b).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not suspending any rule.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಾವೇರಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಬಾರಿ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ 15 ದಿನಗಳ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ರೂಲ್ ಸಸ್ಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವೇ ರೀತಿ ನಮಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ ಸಸ್ಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As and when an occasion arises, we have got inherent right to request the Chair to suspend any rule. 15 days was necessary and that 15 days notice has been waived by your goodself. You have done it in the case of some Bill. Extend the same charity for us and waive this Rule 322.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the request is to come under different circumstances I do not know. I do know that I have got something in writing. It is defective in more than one aspect.

Sri. H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We have given a correct one to the Secretary. I know it should not be addressed to the Speaker but to the Secretary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not suspending any rule until this work is over.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ರೂಲ್ 322 ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲವು ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಸಸ್ಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಿಡಾಯ ತೋರಿಸದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಾನಿರ್ಣಯ ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ 15 ದಿನ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿವೆ, ಈ ರೂಲ್ ಸಸ್ಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ, ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ಬೇಡಿ, ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನೂ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇಂದು ಹನ್ನೆರಡೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಣ ಮುಗಿಯಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಂದು ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನ. ಅದರ ಇಂದು ತಾವು ಸರಕಾರದ ಒತ್ತಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮಣಿದು ಅವಸರವಸರವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ಮನವಿ ತಂದು, ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನೆರಾ.

ಉಪ್ಪಂಫಿ, ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ, ಒಬ್ಬ ಕೆಗದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಮೆದಾರಿಟ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಬಹುಮತವಿರುವ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಲು ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮೂರು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಕರೆದು ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೊತ್ತಿನ ವರೆಗೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Point of order Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please sit down. There is a point of order.

(The Member did not yield)

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Member cannot yield, I have to ask him to retire.

(The Member resumed his seat)

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Mr. Speaker Sir,

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚೆನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಕೋಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ನಿಧೀಪರಾಜ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಏಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೋಶ? ನೀವು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೋಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಇದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಕೋಶವೆಂಬುದನರ್ಥ ಸಾಧನ

ಕೋಶವೇ ನಂನಾರ ಬಂಧನ

ಕೋಶದಿಂದಿಹ ರೇಡ ಸುಕ್ಕತವು ಲಯವನ್ನೆದುಪುದು

ಕೋಶವನು ವರ್ಜಿಸಲು ಬೇಕುದು

ಕೋಶವುಳ್ಳವನಾವನಾಗಲಿ ಕಾಪುರ ಪುಹಪರಕೆ ಚಿತ್ತೈಸೆಂದನಾ ವಿಮರ!

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—My point of order relates to 231. The points of orders and discussion that is going on are totally against the decision taken by this House under 231 this morning. When the question arose up to what time the House should sit for the consideration of the Bill, Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to put that motion before the House to take a decision till what time we should sit. It was then decided that this House should sit till the present Bill relating to Ministers' Salaries and Allowances is considered and passed. That was the only motion for which the present extension is available. Therefore whatever recommendations made by the Business Advisory Committee relating to the non-official work has to be carried out and done here. We have come here to decide the question of Ministers' Salaries and Allowances as per the decision taken under Rule 231. It reads as follows:

“No variation in the Allocation of Time order shall be made except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker and accepted by the Assembly:

Provided that the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the Assembly, increase the time, not exceeding one hour, without any motion being moved.”

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA)

Now the point is, on a motion put by the Hon'ble Speaker himself, the House has decided that the Ministers' Salaries and Allowances Bill should be considered and passed. Therefore, there is no other point. That of course cannot be disregarded, and the appeal to the Hon'ble Speaker for suspending any rule does not arise in view of the decision made by this House this morning. I submit with due respect to the Chair, the Speaker has no power to suspend the rule.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What about Rule 322?

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA—Under Rule 231, an explicit decision is taken by this House that this House should sit for the purpose of consideration and passing of this Bill. Therefore, no other business can be transacted and the Hon'ble Speaker has no power to suspend the rule. There is no question of exceeding the time also under the proviso.

SRI S. GOPALA GOWDA.—Rule 231 proviso says that, the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the Assembly increase the time not exceeding one hour without any motion being moved.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—At 12.30 p.m. this morning we adjourned. The rule specifically says that for extension there should be a motion. Rule 31 says that no variation in the allocation of time order shall be made except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker and accepted by the Assembly. If I could submit, Sir, there was no motion in the morning to extend the time at 12.30 p.m. You were pleased to take the sense of the House and decide that the sitting should continue, that means to say, to continue the Assembly from 12.30 onwards. But, Sir, subsequently somehow you said we adjourn now and meet at 3 p.m. That should not have been done because even under the proviso, we could have given you power to sit for not more than one hour.

MR. SPEAKER.—What is the time allocation?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Upto 12.30 p.m. this morning. According to Committee's decision, it is 3½ hours. That is over long back. No motion is made this morning to extend time. But you took the sense of the House and continued the session. Subsequently you adjourned and asked us to meet at 3 p.m. To extend the time, there should have been a motion. There was no motion from anybody in this House to extend beyond 12.30 p.m. In fact we should not have met at 3 O'clock and we should not have deliberated also. Ruling should be given on that aspect.

MR. SPEAKER.—One more point of order has been raised by Mr. Ranganath.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—I am only supporting the point of order. He was interpreting the rule to his advantage.

MR. SPEAKER.—It is a kind of shifting ground. Mr. Ranganath says there is no point of order. Therefore, I am not giving any ruling. He wants me to understand the point of order raised by Mr. Kothavala;

he supports him and refers to rule 231. He is under the impression, that according to this rule, the House should have been adjourned at 12-30, and therefore any meeting thereafter is improper because there was no motion. Considerable confusion is introduced into that point. Allocation of time order is only with regard to allocation of time with regard to the particular items of business either by the Business Advisory Committee or by the Committee for Non-official Business. In other words, a particular item or a Bill is given 3½ hours; a resolution is given 2 hours. That is what is called allocation of time. That report comes before the House and the House adopts it. It has nothing to do with regard to the time at which the House is to be adjourned. There is no rule which says that at 12-30 under all circumstances, the House becomes powerless to transact any other business. Another idea is, if time is allotted to a Bill or any work is consumed by something else, the Bill goes to the wall or there is no time. I do not know where all these things are got. Anyway, rule 231 is one which says about time allocation order and the decision of the House this morning is that this will be taken up and finished to day. The sense of the House has been gathered and that is why it has been adjourned. The idea proceeds that that time allocation means time allocation of the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಎರಡು ಮನೂವಾ ಕಾನೂನು ಬಂದವೇರೆ ತಾವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಚೈಂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಎರಡು ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳಿಗೆ ಚೈಂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಆರೋ ಕ್ಕೆಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ? ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದೇನದರೆ ಚೈಂ ಮುಗಿದುಹೋಗಿ ಧರ್ಮೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will have it analysed and supplied to the Member in due course.

Sri SIDDAIAH KASHIMATH.—I move the Bill for acceptance of the House.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I have given notice under Rule 73 (2).

MR. SPEAKER.—Then the Member may move the amendment.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I beg to move :

“That the Bill be circulated for the purpose eliciting public opinion by 1st February 1968.”

MR. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion by 1st February 1968.”

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—You did not give ruling on my point. I have given notice of a motion under Rule 153.

MR. SPEAKER.—If it is a point of order, I will hear it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA. I have given notice of no confidence motion against this Ministry under Rule 153. I request you to permit me to move this motion.

5.30 P.M.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ಕೃಷಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತ ಇದ್ದಿರುವ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಣ ಯಥೇಚ್ಛವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಾವು ಅದರ ಮನೆ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ, ಅವರ ಆಳುಕಾಳು ಅದರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಪಾತ್ರೆ ವಸ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಥೇಚ್ಛವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆ ಕಾನೂನಾದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಬೊಕ್ಕಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿನಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೊರೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಅಂದಾಜನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ನೌಕರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಾಗ ಒಂದು ಅಂದೋಳನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಅಂದೋಳನ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿನಗಳನ್ನು ರಜಾ ಆಗಿ ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I rise to a point of order. My learned brother on the left side wants to move a motion for circulation. But Rule 73 says :

“When a Bill is introduced, or on some subsequent occasion, the Member in charge may make one of the following motions in regard to his Bill, namely...”

Now under this rule, the Bill has been introduced and it is under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER.—Please see rule 73 (2) :

“(2) At this stage no amendments to the Bill may be moved, but if the Member in charge moves that the Bill be taken into consideration, any Member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date to be specified in the motion.”

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Sub-clause (3) of Rule 73 says that the details of the Bill shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles. The mover is not allowed to talk. He has not stated anything.

MR. SPEAKER.—He should have raised it before I gave permission.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೌಕರರು ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸದ ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಇಚ್ಛಾ ಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಕಳಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೊರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗುವೆ ಇದರೇ ಇನ್ನು ಎಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನ ಅಥವಾ ಬಹು ಜನ ಈ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಎಂದಿನಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಗುರಿಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅದರ

ಎದ್ದು ಬಂದರೆ ಆಗ ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ನಂದಿಗ್ಗ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಬಡ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ, ಕೂಲಿಕಾರರಿಗೆ, ಕಷ್ಟ ಪಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಜೀವನವನ್ನೇ ಸಾಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದುರ್ಭರವಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇರಿ ತನ್ಮೂಲಕ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 40-50 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಬೊಕ್ಕಸದಿಂದ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸಾಧ್ಯ ವಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸ ಬೇಕು. ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಗೆ ನಾನು ನೂಟಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಅಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲರಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಬಿನ್ನಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MOTION TO ADJOURN CONSIDERATION

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I beg to move :

“That the consideration of Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1967 be adjourned.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the consideration of Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1967 be adjourned.”

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇವತ್ತಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಅಬಾಲಪನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದೆ, ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹೆಸರು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಎಂದು ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯ ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ನಣ್ಣದಾದ, ಅತಿ ನಣ್ಣದಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇವೊತ್ತು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಎಂಟು ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ಇವರೆಗೂ ಕುಳಿತಿರೋಣ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು, ಇವತ್ತು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಇರುವಾಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಆತುರದಿಂದ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಆಸಮಂಜಸವಾದುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು.

ಎರಡನೆ ವಿಷಯವೆಂದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನಲ್ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ಸ್ ಇನ್‌ವಾರ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಕುಳಿತರೆ ಇವತ್ತು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತದೆ ಅನ್ನಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದರ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ತಾರೀಖಾಗಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಿ ಈಗ ಇನ್ನು ಉಳಿದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೊಠಾವಾಲೆಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ನಾಗಾರ್ಜುನಸಾಗರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದು ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಗಳೆದು ಕೇವಲ 20-22 ಜನರಿಗೆ ರಾಧವಾಗುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರಿಗೆ ದೋಷ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅತಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿವೆ, ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳೇನಿವೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಬೆಳಿಗಿನಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಎರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನೂಟಿಸಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಜನರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯ ಕಡೆ